Attorney Docket No. P02055US2A(P344) Reply to Office Action dated May 30, 2008

Amendment dated September 2, 2008

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFICATION

The title has been amended to read "SEQUENTIALLY TERMINATED

ELASTOMERS".

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-4, 8-13, 17, and 19-22 remain in the application. Claims 1 and 10 have

been amended to change the final 'and' to 'or' and to delete repetitive language included

in (ii) starting with "triethoxysilyl ...". Claim 19 has been amended to delete the word

'highly' and has further been amended to include the limitation previously presented in

Claim 22. Claim 22 has thusly been canceled.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

In accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, Claim 1 has been amended to

reflect proper Markush format. Claim 10 has likewise been amended in a manner

consistent with Claim 1.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 8-13, 17, 20, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112

as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

In an effort to overcome the rejection, Claim 1 has been amended to delete the

language "triethoxysilyl propyl chloride, diethoxymethylsilyl propyl

1-(3-bromopropyl)-2,2,5,5-tetramethyl-1-aza-2,5diethylcarbamyl chloride,

disilacyclopentane" which was inadvertently left in Applicants' previous amendment.

The deleted compounds are subsequently included in (iv) - (vii) of Claim 1.

Claim 10 has likewise been amended to delete repetitive language in a manner

consistent with Claim 1.

8 of 11

Attorney Docket No. P02055US2A(P344) Reply to Office Action dated May 30, 2008

Amendment dated September 2, 2008

The Examiner has rejected claims 19-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for failing to

particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as

the invention.

In an effort to overcome the rejection, Claim 19 has been amended to delete the

word "highly."

DOUBLE PATENTING

The Examiner has provisionally rejected claim 19 on the ground of nonstatutory

obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3, 9, and 10 of

copending Application No. 10/579,954, which corresponds to U.S. Pub. No.

2007/0149744. Likewise, the Examiner has further provisionally rejected Claim 19 on

the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable

over claims 10-31 of copending Application No. 11/507,692, which corresponds to U.S.

Pub. No. 2007/054995. As neither application 10/579,954 nor 11/507,692 has to date

issued as a patent, the Applicant will consider the necessity of a terminal disclaimer at a

later time and only after issuance of patented claims in said applications, or if there are

no other rejections by the Examiner in the subject application.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 102

The Examiner has rejected Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated

by Ozawa et al, citing foreign publication WO 03/046020 and further referencing U.S.

Pub. No. 2005/0070672. The Examiner states that the reference discloses, in at least

preparation Example 13, a sequentially functionalized polymer comprising a first stage to

incorporate a functionalized epoxide, and a second stage to incorporate an imine

functionality.

Applicant has amended Claim 19 to include the limitation "where X' is selected

from the group consisting of monoglycidyl siloxanes and monoglycidyl ether-terminated

polysiloxanes, and where Y' is selected from the group consisting of N,N-diethyl amino

9 of 11

Attorney Docket No. P02055US2A(P344) Reply to Office Action dated May 30, 2008 Amendment dated September 2, 2008

carbonyl chloride, and 1-(3-bromopropyl)-2,2,5,5-tetramethyl-1-aza-2,5disilacyclopentane".

This recitation derives from original Claim 22, which ostensibly contained allowable subject matter, and therefore Applicants believe that Claim 19 should now be in condition for allowance.

Attorney Docket No. P02055US2A(P344) Reply to Office Action dated May 30, 2008

Amendment dated September 2, 2008

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicants request early and favorable reconsideration in the form of a

Notice of Allowance.

If necessary to affect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a

petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to affect a timely response. The

Commissioner is specifically authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 06-0925 in the

event that an additional fee is due or that any amount should be credited.

Respectfully submitted,

September 2, 2008

Date

Arthur M. Reginelli Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 40,139

Renner, Kenner, Greive, Bobak, Taylor & Weber

106 South Main Street, 4th Floor

Akron, OH 44308

Phone: 330-376-1242 Fax: 330-376-9646